UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,777	08/07/2003	Akiyoshi Mikami	50024-015	1705
	7590 07/24/200 , WILL & EMERY	EXAMINER		
600 13th Street, N.W.			THOMPSON, CAMIE S	
Washington, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/635,777	MIKAMI, AKIYOSHI	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Camie S. Thompson	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tired will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>RCL</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 13,14 and 22 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 13,14 and 22 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	or election requirement.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/14/08.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/635,777 Page 2

Art Unit: 1794

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 14, 2008 has been entered.
- 2. Applicant's amendment and accompanying remarks filed July 14, 2008 are acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 22 is rendered indefinite because it depends from cancelled claim 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/635,777

Art Unit: 1794

6. Claims 13, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 64-027194 in view of Okajima et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,700,591 and in further view of *Red Electroluminescence from MgS:Eu and Mg_{1-x}Ca_{xS:Eu} Thin Film Phosphor prepared by RF-sputtering Technique, Akiyoshi Mikami, Ishikawa, Japan, pp. 1-3.*

Page 3

The Japanese reference discloses a thin film EL element comprising a transparent electrode; a glass substrate; a first insulation layer; a light emitting layer comprising a composition of $Mg_{1-x}Ca_xS$ wherein the value of x is $0 \le x \le 0.9$; a second insulating layer; and an aluminum electrode as required by present claim 13 (see abstract). The Japanese reference does not disclose the material of the first insulation. Okajima discloses a light emitting thin film element comprising a light emitting layer sandwiched in between two barrier layers wherein the light emitting layer can comprise an alkaline earth sulfide such as calcium magnesium sulfide (see column 1, line 65-column 2, line 4). The Japanese reference also discloses that the barrier layers can be magnesium sulfide as per instant claim 1 (see column 5, lines 5-34). Neither the Japanese reference nor the Okajima does not disclose that the composition of Eu to Mg is not larger than 0.1. However, this is an optimizable feature. The concentration of the activator affects the luminescence of the light emitting layer. Discovery of optimum values of a result effect variable Involves only routine skill in the art in re Boesch, 617, F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a composition ratio of Eu to Mg being not larger than 0.1 in order to have a device that his higher luminescence. Additionally, neither the Japanese reference or the Okajima reference discloses that the magnesium sulfide and the $Mg_{1-x}Ca_xS$ have an orientation in the <100> direction. The

Art Unit: 1794

Mikami reference disclose light emitting phosphors such as MgS:Eu and Mg_{1-x}Ca_xS having an orientation in the <100> direction. Okajima discloses that the barrier layers (MgS) are formed from RF-sputtering (see example 1 of Okajima). The Mikami reference discloses that the phosphors are formed by RF-sputtering. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the MgS and Mg_{1-x}Ca_xS of the Okajima and Japanese reference have an orientation in the <100> direction since the prior art demonstrates that RF-sputtering allows for MgS and Mg_{1-x}Ca_xS to have an orientation in the <100> direction.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the present claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Camie S. Thompson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached at (571) 272-1748. The fax phone number for the Group is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/635,777 Page 5

Art Unit: 1794

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Bruce H Hess/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794